



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,449	08/15/2002	Alexander James Brown	010100-109	3885
21836	7590	08/09/2006	EXAMINER	
HENRICKS SLAVIN AND HOLMES LLP SUITE 200 840 APOLLO STREET EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245			GILES, NICHOLAS G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/049,449	BROWN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nicholas G. Giles	2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 111-114 and 116-130 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 121-126 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 111-114, 116-120 and 127-130 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 111 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Drawings

2. The drawings were received on 07/05/2006. These drawings are accepted.

Claim Objections

3. The objections to claims 112-120 are withdrawn as the claims have been amended to reflect the pending claims they depend on.

Double Patenting

4. The double patenting issue of claims 112 and 115 being substantial duplicates has been corrected with the canceling of claim 115.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 111-114 and 116-130 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,813) in view of Jain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,375).

Regarding claim 111, Enright et al. discloses:

A digital video management system including: a plurality of cameras (186, 188, 190 Fig. 11) for providing respective first video signals to a computer communications network (21:20-41); a video server for linking to the network, configured to receive the first video signals and configured to be responsive to a predetermined schedule for storing on a storage media associated with the server at least some of the first video signals (48:54-49:8); at least one client computer terminal for linking to the network for providing the predetermined schedule and for receiving the second signals (4:54-49:8).

Enright et al is silent with regards to selectively accessing playback of video signals and live video signals. Jain et al. discloses:

The server is configured to access the stored signals and to access the first video signals to selectively provide playback second video signals and live second video signals respectively (8:34-59).

An advantage of providing playback or live signals (for example of a football game like Jain mentions throughout the patent) is that while watching live signals the user can decide they want to view an “instant-replay” to review video they just watched (26:47-67). For this reason it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to have Enright's system include selectively accessing playback of video signals and live video signals.

Regarding claim 112, see the rejection of claim 111 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The predetermined schedule includes a plurality of time based trigger points and the server stores the first images starting at a first predetermined period prior to each point and a second predetermined period after each point (18:30-46 and 21:20-41).

Regarding claim 113, see the rejection of claim 111 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The predetermined schedule includes a plurality of event based trigger points and the server stores the first images starting at a first predetermined period prior to each point and a second predetermined period after each point (18:30-46 and 21:20-41).

Regarding claim 114, see the rejection of claim 112 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

A sensor for providing a third signal to the network, wherein one of the event based trigger points comprises the third signal falling within a predetermined range (Motion detection 18:30-46).

Regarding claim 116, see the rejection of claim 112 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The first and second predetermined periods are configurable based upon one or more of: on a per camera basis, on a per area basis, on an event type basis (21:20-41 and 35:56-36:16).

Regarding claim 117, see the rejection of claim 112 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The duration of the first and second predetermined periods are configurable (18:30-46).

Regarding claim 118, see the rejection of claim 111 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

A plurality of client terminals and a controller for controlling the second signals that are provided to respective terminals (Terminals 37:28-47 and Control 37:13-27).

Regarding claim 119, see the rejection of claim 118 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The terminals provide over the network respective camera control commands to the video server and the video server processes those commands and generates control signals that are sent to the relevant camera via the network (35:15-23).

Regarding claim 120, see the rejection of claim 118 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The processing of the commands by the video server includes a determination of whether or not the terminal sending the respective command has access rights to the relevant camera (37:13-27).

Regarding claim 127, see the rejection of claim 111 and note that Enright and Jain are silent with regards to compressing the first video signals. Official Notice is taken that it was well known at the time the invention was made for cameras to compress video signals. An advantage to doing is that that bandwidth usage is reduced when transmitting the video signals. For this reason it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compress the first video signals.

Regarding claim 128, see the rejection of claim 111 and note that Jain further discloses:

Cameras are linked to the network via camera streamers (9:53-56, and sensor host 206 Fig. 3).

An advantage to using camera streamers is that preprocessing operations can be performed before transmission of the data (9:51-53). For this reason it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have Enright's system include camera streamers.

Regarding claim 129, see the rejection of claim 128 and note that Enright and Jain are silent with regards to the camera streamers compressing the video signals. Official Notice is taken that it was well known at the time the invention was made to compress video signals before using a camera streamer to put the video on a network.

An advantage to doing is that that bandwidth usage is reduced when transmitting the video signals. For this reason it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compress the first video signals.

Regarding claim 30, see the rejection of claim 128 and note that Enright and Jain are silent with regards to packetizing the video before placing in onto a network. Official Notice is taken that it was well known at the time the invention was made to packetize video before placing it on a network. An advantage to doing so is that the Internet TCP protocol can be used to transfer the video. For this reason it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to packetize the video data for a network.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas G. Giles whose telephone number is (571) 272-2824. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30am to 4:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ngoc - Yen Vu can be reached on (571) 272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NGG



DAVID OMETZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER